**Supplemental Analyses**

Study 2 also measured beliefs about the volunteer’s competence and integrity, as well as benevolence (which is defined as the extent to which the trustee wants to do good to the trustor), given that all three trusting beliefs have been considered to be important determinants of trusting intentions ([e.g., Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995](#_ENREF_36)), and tested whether they would also support our predictions.

***Perceived competence*.** Three items assessing perceptions of the volunteer’s competence were drawn from Kim et al. ([2004](#_ENREF_28)): 1) This individual is capable of performing this kind of job, 2) This individual has adequate knowledge about the work this job requires, and 3) I feel confident about this individual’s skills. Respondents rated these items on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) (α = .79).

***Perceived integrity*.** Three items assessing perceptions of the volunteer’s integrity were also drawn from Kim et al. ([2004](#_ENREF_28)): 1) I like this individual’s values, 2) Sound principles seem to guide this individual’s behavior, and 3) This individual has a great deal of integrity, using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) (α = .88).

***Perceived benevolence*.** Three items assessing perceptions of the volunteer’s benevolence were developed from the analysis of this construct by Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman ([1995](#_ENREF_36)): 1) It seems this individual wants to do good for me, 2) Even if this individual isn’t required to help me, I feel they would, and 3) I believe this individual would look out for me, using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) (α = .87).

**Hypothesis Tests**

To assess how justifications would affect the implications of apologies for these trusting beliefs and how this would depend on the intended beneficiary, we first conducted a 2 (intended beneficiary: self vs. other) × 4 (violation response: apology plus equity vs. apology plus equality vs. apology plus need vs. apology alone) MANOVA. This analysis revealed a significant main effect for intended beneficiary, Wilks’ Lambda = .91, *F*(3, 155) = 5.09, *p* < .01; η2 = .09 [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 157) = 0.02, *p* = .88, η2 = .00); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 157) = 10.90, *p* < .001, η2 = .07); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 157) = 9.79, *p* < .01, η2 = .06)]. The analysis also revealed a marginally significant main effect for violation response, Wilks’ Lambda = .91, *F*(9, 149) = 1.70, *p* < .10; η2 = .03 [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 157) = 1.84, *p* = .14, η2 = .03); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 157) = 1.96, *p* = .11, η2 = .04); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 157) = 3.29, *p* < .05, η2 = .06)]. However, these findings were ultimately qualified by a significant Intended Beneficiary × Violation Response interaction, Wilks’ Lambda = .80, *F*(9, 149) = 3.94 *p* < .001; η2 = .07 [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 157) = 1.34, *p* = .26, η2 = .03); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 157) = 3.56, *p* < .05, η2 = .06); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 157) = 5.98, *p* < .001, η2 = .10)].

Then, to test Hypothesis 1, which predicted that an apology that has been combined with a justification would result in higher trust (than an apology alone) when the violation was intended to benefit another party (than when the violation was intended to benefit the self), we conducted the same planned contrast of this interaction effect as in Study 1 (Contrast #1). This analysis revealed a significant Intended Beneficiary × Violation Response interaction, Wilks’ Lambda = .88, *F*(3, 155) = 6.95, *p* < .001; η2 = .07, [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 157) = 0.28, *p* = .60, η2 = .00); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 157) = 10.46, *p* < .001, η2 = .06); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 157) = 12.90, *p* < .001, η2 = .08)]. This interaction reveals that whereas an apology plus justification was significantly more effective than an apology alone when the violation was committed to benefit another (Wilks’ Lambda = .77, *F*(3, 78) = 7.98, *p* < .001; η2 = .24) [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 78) = 0.24, *p* = .63, η2 = .00); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 78) = 8.91, *p* < .01, η2 = .10); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 78) = 11.72, *p* < .001, η2 = .13)], this was not the case (or even reversed) when the violation was committed to benefit the self (Wilks’ Lambda = .95, *F*(3, 79) = 1.32, *p* = .27; η2 = .05) [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 82) = 0.07, *p* = .80, η2 = .00); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 82) = 2.66, *p* = .11, η2 = .03); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 82) = 2.76, *p* = .10, η2 = .03)]. These findings support Hypothesis 1.

Next, to evaluate H2, which predicted that an apology combined with an equity-based justification would result in higher trust than an apology combined with a justification based on equality or need, we tested planned Contrast #2. This contrast revealed that the addition of equity-based justifications to an apology was more beneficial for trust than the addition of equality- or need-based justifications, Wilks’ Lambda = .94, *F*(3, 155) = 3.16, *p* < .05; η2 = .06, [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 157) = 5.39, *p* < .05, η2 = .03); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 157) = 2.60, *p* = .11, η2 = .02); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 157) = 6.95, *p* < .01, η2 = .04)], thus supporting Hypothesis 2.

Then, to evaluate H3, which predicted that an apology combined with a need-based justification when the intended beneficiary is the self would result in lower trust than an apology combined with an equity- or equality-based justification when the intended beneficiary is the self or an apology combined with equity-, equality-, or need-based justifications when the intended beneficiary is another, we tested Contrast #3. This analysis revealed that the addition of a need-based justification to an apology when the intended beneficiary was the self led to significantly lower trust than the remaining apology plus justification conditions, Wilks’ Lambda = .93, *F*(3, 155) = 3.67, *p* < .05; η2 = .07, [Perceived Competence (*F*(1, 162) = 0.00, *p* = .95, η2 = .00); Perceived Integrity (*F*(1, 162) = 14.06, *p* < .001, η2 = .07); Perceived Benevolence (*F*(1, 162) = 4.66, *p* < .05, η2 = .02)], thus supporting Hypothesis 3.

**Mediation Analyses**

Finally, we tested Hypothesis 4’s prediction that perceptions of fairness would mediate the Intended Beneficiary × Violation Response interaction’s effects on participants’ trusting beliefs with the same moderated mediation analysis used in Studies 1 and 2. These results revealed that Perceived Fairness significantly mediated the effects for Perceived Competence (LL = -.19, UL = -0.02), Perceived Integrity (LL = -.39, UL = -0.05), and Perceived Benevolence (LL = -.36, UL = -0.04), as evidenced by the fact that the 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. This supports Hypothesis 4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 5** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Study 2: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Inter-Correlations** | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | Variable | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Perceived Competence | 4.09 | 1.33 | (0.79) |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Perceived Integrity | 2.84 | 1.31 | .42\*\* | (0.88) |  |  |  |
| 3 | Perceived Benevolence | 2.94 | 1.26 | .33\*\* | .69\*\* | (0.87) |  |  |
| 4 | Trusting Intentions | 2.64 | 1.07 | .32\*\* | .71\*\* | .65\*\* | (0.83) |  |
| 5 | Perceived Fairness | 2.60 | 1.31 | .29\*\* | .68\*\* | .66\*\* | .65\*\* | (0.80) |
| Note: N=165. Reliabilities are on the diagonal in parentheses. | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| \*\**p* < .01 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 6** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Study 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Confidence Interval by Condition** | | | | | | | |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *95% CI* |  | *M* | *SD* | *95% CI* |
|  | **Justification (plus apology)** | | | | | | |
|  | Self (N = 66) | | |  | Other (N = 65) | | |
| Perceived Competence | 4.10 | 1.23 | [3.80, 4.40] |  | 4.04 | 1.47 | [3.68, 4.40] |
| Perceived Integrity | 2.36 | 1.22 | [2.07, 2.65] |  | 3.41 | 1.21 | [3.12, 3.70] |
| Perceived Benevolence | 2.50 | 1.13 | [2.23, 2.77] |  | 3.49 | 1.22 | [3.19, 3.79] |
|  | **Apology (alone)** | | | | | | |
|  | Self (N = 17) | | |  | Other (N = 17) | | |
| Perceived Competence | 4.02 | 1.22 | [3.44, 4.60] |  | 4.25 | 1.34 | [3.61, 4.89] |
| Perceived Integrity | 2.94 | 1.45 | [2.25, 3.63] |  | 2.43 | 1.07 | [1.92, 2.94] |
| Perceived Benevolence | 3.04 | 1.24 | [2.45, 3.63] |  | 2.41 | 1.13 | [1.87, 2.95] |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Equity** | | | | | | |
|  | Self (N = 19) | | |  | Other (N = 20) | | |
| Perceived Competence | 4.18 | 1.60 | [3.46, 4.90] |  | 4.78 | 1.23 | [4.24, 5.32] |
| Perceived Integrity | 2.68 | 1.22 | [2.13, 3.23] |  | 3.60 | 1.07 | [3.13, 4.07] |
| Perceived Benevolence | 2.77 | 1.05 | [2.30, 3.24] |  | 4.00 | 0.99 | [3.57, 4.43] |
|  | **Equality** | | | | | | |
|  | Self (N = 24) | | |  | Other (N = 25) | | |
| Perceived Competence | 4.06 | 1.18 | [3.59, 4.53] |  | 3.69 | 1.27 | [3.19, 4.19] |
| Perceived Integrity | 2.47 | 1.09 | [2.03, 2.91] |  | 3.48 | 1.24 | [2.99, 3.97] |
| Perceived Benevolence | 2.31 | 1.13 | [1.86, 2.76] |  | 3.63 | 1.31 | [3.12, 4.14] |
|  | **Need** | | | | | | |
|  | Self (N = 23) | | |  | Other (N = 20) | | |
| Perceived Competence | 4.09 | 0.98 | [3.69, 4.49] |  | 3.73 | 1.71 | [2.98, 4.48] |
| Perceived Integrity | 1.99 | 1.31 | [1.45, 2.53] |  | 3.12 | 1.32 | [2.54, 3.70] |
| Perceived Benevolence | 2.48 | 1.19 | [1.99, 2.97] |  | 2.82 | 1.07 | [2.35, 3.29] |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 7** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Study 2: Results of Moderated Mediation** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Direct Effects on Fairness** | *B* | *SE* | *t* | *p* | *CI* |
| Violation Response | 0.10 | 0.06 | 1.65 | 0.100 | [-.02, .22] |
| Intended Beneficiary | -0.14 | 0.10 | -1.36 | 0.176 | [-.33, .06] |
| Violation Response × Intended Beneficiary | -0.15 | 0.06 | -2.4 | 0.017 | [-.26, -.03] |
| **Direct Effects on Trusting Beliefs** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Violation Response → Perceived Competence | -0.05 | 0.06 | -0.75 | 0.451 | [-.17, .08] |
| Perceived Fairness → Perceived Competence | 0.30 | 0.08 | 3.91 | 0.000 | [.15, .45] |
| Violation Response → Perceived Integrity | -0.02 | 0.05 | -0.43 | 0.668 | [-.11, .07] |
| Perceived Fairness → Perceived Integrity | 0.68 | 0.06 | 11.63 | 0.000 | [.57, .80] |
| Violation Response → Perceived Benevolence | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.975 | [-.09, .09] |
| Perceived Fairness → Perceived Benevolence | 0.64 | 0.06 | 11.2 | 0.000 | [.53, .75] |
| **Indirect Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Violation Response × Intended Beneficiary → Perceived Fairness → Perceived Competence | -0.09 | 0.04 | ^ | ^ | [-.19, -.02] |
| Violation Response × Intended Beneficiary → Perceived Fairness → Perceived Integrity | -0.20 | 0.09 | ^ | ^ | [-.39, -.05] |
| Violation Response × Intended Beneficiary → Perceived Fairness → Perceived Benevolence | -0.19 | 0.08 | ^ | ^ | [-.36, -.04] |
| ^ Statistic not applicable when assessing indirect effects and reporting the index of moderated mediation. | | | | | |
|
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**Study 2: Effects of an Apology vs. Justification on Trusting Beliefs as a Function of the Intended Beneficiary**
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**Study 2: Effects of Equity, Equality, and Need on Trusting Beliefs as a Function of the Intended Beneficiary**